

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of June 9, 2011, claims 1, 8, 11, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 30, and 40 have been amended. Claims 7, 22 and 23 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 11, 19, 21, 24, 26, and 30 have been amended to recite “wherein the at least one auxiliary element displays a non-navigational selectable function.” Claim 40 has been similarly amended to recite “wherein the associated submenu displays a non-navigational selectable function.” Support for this amendment can be found in the application as filed, including at page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 12 and in element 4b of the Figures.

In view of these amendments, claims 6, 8, 13 and 34-38 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found in the application as filed, including at page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 12, and in element 4a of the Figures.

Claims 24, 25 and 39 have been amended to recite a “non-transitory computer readable medium stored with instructions, which when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform:...”. Support for this amendment can be found in the application as filed, including at page 8, lines 18-21.

Claim Objections

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 22-25 are objected to for informalities. Applicants note that claims 22-23 have been cancelled.

With respect to claims 24-25, it is asserted that the term “storage medium” is not defined in the specification. Claims 24-25 have been amended to recite “A non-transitory computer readable medium stored with instructions.” It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are clear in view of the specification and would be understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art, and it is respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 103

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-27, 29-30 and 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. (U.S.

5,623,613, hereinafter Rowe) in view of Nowlan et al. (U.S. 6,169,538, hereinafter Nowlan).

With respect to claim 1, it is asserted that Rowe teaches the invention as claimed, except that it fails to teach “simultaneously displaying a magnified version of the active selection element along with at least one auxiliary element and at least a magnified version of at least a portion of a selection element adjacent the active selection element.” However, it is asserted that this feature is taught by Nowlan, and that it would have been obvious to combine these teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “wherein the at least one auxiliary element displays a non-navigational selectable function.” This feature of the present invention is described in the application at page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 12. The present invention comprises auxiliary elements (4b in the Figures) that are used to indicate non-navigational functions that can be selected. For example, as shown in Figure 1 and described at page 5, lines 15-20, “Selection aids 4b, which in this embodiment are selection symbols which form a shortcut menu, are shown in active selection element 3. These auxiliary elements 4b indicate the functions which can be used quickly. From said active selection element 3 it is possible to choose three different functions by using the shortcut menu of the active selection element.” In contrast to such auxiliary elements (4b), the application also describes auxiliary elements which are navigation aids (4a), which indicate directions which are allowed for navigation.

The cited references Rowe and Nowlan fail to disclose the feature of amended claim 1 of “wherein the at least one auxiliary element displays a non-navigational selectable function”. For example, in rejecting claim 7, the Office asserted that Rowe teaches that “at least one auxiliary element displays a selectable function” because the arrows in Figure 8 are selectable functions, as they are selected to navigate to another selectable element. While Applicants do not agree that the arrows in Figure 8 of Rowe disclose a “selectable function”, it is clear that the arrows do display a “non-navigational selectable function”, as the function of the arrows is navigation.

Therefore, because Rowe and Nowlan fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1 as amended, it is respectfully submitted that the claim is non-obvious and in allowable form.

Because independent claims 11, 19, 21, 24, 26, 30 and 40 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also non-obvious and in allowable form.

At least in view of their dependency on the independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20, 25, 27, 29, 32-39 and 41-45 are also non-obvious and in allowable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned respectfully submits that no fee is due for filing this Amendment. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to deposit account 23-0442 any fee deficiency required to submit this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 25, 2011

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 010495

/Steven T. Cooper/
Steven T. Cooper
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 65,716